

REMARKS

The Office Action of 04/04/2006 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.


The claims were rejected by reason of various informalities and have been amended to overcome the same.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as being anticipated by Wilstrup. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Wilstrup fails to teach at least the feature of claim 1 of "adjusting an output impedance of the power supply unit to a value selected for the electronic circuit, the value having been selected so that a resonance circuit that comprises a connection between the power supply unit and the electronic circuit is substantially critically dampened." The decoupling capacitor 422 of Wilstrup is not a resonant circuit, which requires two energy storage elements (e.g., LC combination 140, 142 of Figure 1 of the present specification). Because the decoupling capacitor 422 of Wilstrup is not a resonant circuit, "critical damping" as that term is used in claim 1 has no meaning as applied to Wilstrup.

With the foregoing clarifications, the claims are now believed to be allowable. Notice of the same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: July 28, 2006